

CD
GH at least one FIFO structure containing a plurality of said
memory objects and transmitting data in a data-controlled data
transfer controlled by the data objects being transmitted.--

Remarks:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-4 and 6-25 are now in the application. Claims 1
and 22 have been amended. Claim 5 have been canceled. Claims
23-25 have been added.

In item 1 of the Office action, the Examiner objected to the
IDS because only the cover of the reference was enclosed. A
copy of the pertinent sections of the reference has been
requested and will be forwarded to the Examiner upon receipt.

In item 2 of the Office action, the Examiner objected to the
drawings because the schematics needed to be labeled with
information in addition to the reference number. Labels have
been added on the enclosed amended drawings.

In item 3 of the Office action, the Examiner objected to the labels give to Figs. 3(a)-(d). These labels have been corrected on the enclosed amended drawings.

In item 4 of the Office action, the Examiner objected to claim 22 because the abbreviation CAN was not defined. Claim 22 has been amended to define CAN as a Controller Area Network.

Accordingly, the specification and the claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs. Should the Examiner find any further objectionable items, counsel would appreciate a telephone call during which the matter may be resolved. The above noted changes to the claims are provided solely for the purpose of satisfying the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. The changes are not provided for overcoming the prior art.

In item 7 of the Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6, 12, 19, and 21 as being obvious over Leger (U.S. 5,732,286) in view of Klingeholfer (U.S. 5,884,099) under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

In item 21 of the Office action, the Examiner indicated that claims 5, 7-11, 13-18 would be allowable if rewritten to

contain all of the features of their base claim and any intervening dependent claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to contain the features of claim 5 and claim 5 has been canceled. Claim 1 therefore contains allowable subject matter.

Accordingly, none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over the art. And, because claims 2-4 and 6-22 ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

Claims 23-25 are independent claims based on originally-filed claims 7, 9, and 11, respectively. These independent claims contain subject matter that the Examiner has already indicated as allowable.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-4 and 6-25 are solicited. In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, please telephone counsel so that patentable language can be substituted.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within a period of two months pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of \$380 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

Please charge any other fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicants

LOREN DONALD PEARSON
REG. NO. 42,987

LDP:cgm

September 12, 2000

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101